

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 23 are pending in this application. Withdrawn Claims 10-22 and 24-26 are canceled by the present response without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9 and 23 are amended by the present response to clarify subject matter recited therein and to better comply with U.S. claim drafting practice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4). Claims 1, 4, 7-9 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,088,146 to Takeshita et al. (herein “Takeshita”). Claims 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeshita in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0057331 A1 to Kato. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeshita in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,307,799 to Ngoi et al. (herein “Ngoi”)

Addressing first the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5), that objection is traversed by the present response.

Filed with the present response is a replacement formal drawing for original Figure 1. Replacement Figure 1 properly labels elements 1A’, 14B and 3B, which were inadvertently not properly labeled in original Figure 1. The replacement Figure is believed to address the objection to the original drawings.

Applicants and Applicants’ representatives wish to thank Examiners Khatri and Cherry for the personal interview on October 24, 2005. During the interview the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail. Although, during the interview claim amendments were discussed to clarify the feature of the beams having an open angle  $\theta$  in a deflecting rotation plane recited in Claims 1 and 23, the present response presents discussions below to clarify

subject matter with respect to features of the scanning lenses recited in Claims 1 and 23 to distinguish over the applied art.

Addressing the rejection based on Takeshita, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an optical scanner, and recites the features of the scanning lenses, among other features, as follows:

scanning lenses proximate to the target surfaces, among the at least two scanning lenses, configured to guide the beams to different target surfaces ***have optical actions different from each other.***

Referring to the non-limiting embodiment shown in Figs. 1 and 2, the scanning lenses (6A, 6A', 6B, 6B'), which are proximate to the target surfaces and configured to guide the beams to different target surfaces (8A, 8A', 8B, 8B'), have optical actions different from each other. Therefore, according to the present invention recited in Claim 1 as currently written, the relative sub scan image surface curvature between the beams corresponding to different target surfaces is effectively reduced. Also, a small and stable spot diameter is effectively achieved.<sup>1</sup>

The above-noted features recited in Claim 1 are clearly distinguishable over Takeshita. In this regard, the Office Action asserts that Takeshita discloses in Fig. 7 that the scanning lenses (2A-2B) proximate to the target surfaces (11-14) for guiding the beams (Fig. 7) to different target surfaces (11-14) have optical actions different from each other (Fig. 7).

Nevertheless, Takeshita discloses at column 8, lines 22- 29 as follows:

... In FIG. 7. a printer head 20 is built around a polygon mirror 1 driven by a polygon motor (not shown) so as to rotate at uniform speed, and has four laser diodes 21a to 21d, ***scanning lenses 2A and 2B***, and other optical components ***arranged symmetrically with respect to the plane that includes the axis of rotation of the polygon mirror 1 and that is perpendicular to the sheet transfer direction.***

---

<sup>1</sup> See the present specification at page 14, lines 10-16, for example.

Thus, the scanning lenses (2A and 2B) in Takeshita are each provided at right and left sides of the polygon mirror (1), each passing through the rotational axis of the polygon mirror (1) and being in symmetrical with respect to the optical axis of the scanning lenses. Thus, a scanning lens proximate to the target surfaces (13 and 14) among the scanning lenses (2A), and a scanning lens proximate to the target surfaces (11 and 12) among the scanning lenses (2B) have the same optical actions as each other. Nowhere does Takeshita disclose or suggest that the scanning lenses proximate to the target surfaces, among the at least two scanning lenses, configured to guide the beams to different target surfaces *have optical actions different from each other*, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Takeshita is not believed to anticipate the specific features recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Amended independent Claim 23 is considered allowable at least for the reasons advanced for Claim 1 to the extent that Claim 23 includes features substantially similar to Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-9 are considered allowable at least for the reasons advanced for Claim 1 from which they depend directly or indirectly.

As no other issues are pending in this application it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for formal allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM/SNS/HY:mda`  
I:\ATTY\HY\24\249422US\249422\_AME.DOC

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1. This sheet, which includes FIGS. 1 and 2, replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 1 and 2.

Attachment: One Replacement Sheet